

IMPACT OF PERSONAL MOTIVATION ON THE INTENTION AND BEHAVIOUR OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

Bassem Salhi, Majmaah University

ABSTRACT

Social entrepreneurship has become one of the finest solutions for addressing various social, environmental and economic problems. Deeper understanding of entrepreneurship can help both researchers and policy makers to evaluate the different phenomena related to entrepreneurship.

Throughout this study, we have sought to bring together required elements to respond to the following question:

How can the motivation, intention and behaviour of social entrepreneurs be explained? In other words, to what extent do personal and contextual variables affect the motivations, intentions and behaviours of social entrepreneurs?

The model is based on a quantitative study conducted by 186 Saudi business owners during 2016. Our primary results show that in terms of intention, personal motivations do not explain this variable for Saudi social entrepreneurs. Our empirical investigations also reveal that the intention variable is not significant in determining the behaviour of social entrepreneurs.

Keywords: Social Entrepreneurship, Personal Motivation, Entrepreneurial Intention, Behaviour.

INTRODUCTION

Social entrepreneurship has increasingly become a durable solution for reconciling financial interests and economic and social values (Stryjan, 2006; Short et al, 2009; Nicholls, 2010; Newth, 2016). The worldwide interest in this subject follows a global vision that is committed to the social dimension of business decisions and decisions concerning proper employment (Dees, 1998; Bornstein, 2004; Salamon, 2012; Mishra and Zachary, 2015). In fact, understanding the intentions of entrepreneurs can also help both researchers and policy makers to evaluate the different phenomena related to entrepreneurship (Fruchterman, 2011; Santos, 2012; Salhi and Boujelbene, 2013; Woodfield and al, 2017).

Inspired by different published studies that have analysed social entrepreneurship, our research aims to respond to the following question:

How to explain the motivations, intentions and behaviour of social entrepreneurs? In motivations, intentions and behaviours of social entrepreneurs?"

This research aims to understand the context of social entrepreneurs' motivations (model No 1), as well as the formation of the intentions and behaviours of these entrepreneurs (model No 2). The research questions addressed in this study are as follows:

-To what extent can personal motivations influence the intentions of social entrepreneurs?

The data have been collected through responses to a standardized questionnaire. The questionnaire was sent to a heterogeneous population of 186 owners of Saudi businesses to

measure the effect of various personal motivations on the intentions and behaviours of social entrepreneurs.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

Effect of Personal Motivations on Intentions

Although considered to be one of the less understood factors affecting entrepreneurial behaviour, psychological characteristics of entrepreneurs have increasingly received attention by such scholars as McClelland, (1961) and Brockhaus, (1982). Recently, researchers have focused on personality traits of active entrepreneurs (Dawson and Henley, 2012; Eijdenberg and Masurel, 2013; Langevang et al., 2012). A series of psychological characteristics that are considered effective indicators of entrepreneurial behaviour have gradually been assembled following the pioneering works of McClelland (1961).

These works provide us with a literature review useful for our research, as well as a chronology of traits associated with the entrepreneurial behaviour of social entrepreneurs. These studies also provide us with the necessary tools to support our first general hypothesis.

H1: Personal motivations positively influence the intentions of social entrepreneurs.

Need for Achievement

McClelland (1961) has defined the term desire for achievement or need for achievement as the desire to do good things aiming at achieving an internal feeling of personal accomplishment. Many empirically confirmed results show the presence of a positive relationship between the need for achievement and entrepreneurial success (Lynn, 1969; Durand and Shea, 1974).

On the basis of these results, Collins et al. (2000) have concluded that the need for achievement is an effective tool to distinguish between enterprise creators and the population in general. However, to differentiate between enterprise creators and managers, these authors have concluded that the need for achievement could be particularly effective in distinguishing between different groups of enterprise creators and assessing their successes. Thus, the need for achievement could play a very useful role in explaining entrepreneurial activity. We can therefore state our first hypothesis:

H1.1: The "Need for Achievement" has a positive impact on the personal motivations of social entrepreneurs.

Risk-Taking

Risk-taking as another motivating factor has emerged from the work of McClelland (1961) in an original study about entrepreneurs. McClelland has confirmed that people with high needs for success would have the personal trait to take moderate risks.

According to a common interpretation by Hunter, Kapp, and Yonkers, (2003), in the context of entrepreneurial projects, a risk taker is someone who pursues a business idea for which the probability of success is low.

A study conducted by Xiao et al., (2001) examines the level of risk tolerance among the family-businesses owners and non-business owners. Atkinson (1957) also argued that individuals with a great motivation prefer entrepreneurial activities of intermediate risk because these types of activities pose a challenge. Similarly, Busenitz (1999) argued that entrepreneurs have a tendency to consider situations more favourably than non-entrepreneurs. We can therefore state our second hypothesis:

H1.2: Risk taking positively influences the personal motivation of social entrepreneurs

Tolerance for Ambiguity

According to Norton, (1975), a person who has low ambiguity tolerance reacts prematurely, where stress stops the ambiguous stimuli. Conversely, a person with high ambiguity tolerance perceives ambiguous situations as desirable, difficult and interesting stimuli and ignores their complexities. There is, in fact, a degree of support for this prediction.

Ambiguity tolerance is an important trait for entrepreneurs. This tolerance is valuable according to Tsui (1993) because the challenges and the potential of success associated with the creation of enterprises are by definition unpredictable. Begley (1995) defines ambiguity tolerance as the ability to regard situations with no clear results as attractive, rather than threatening.

This inconsistency in the results and the potential for methodological problems in the research lend support to the type of tolerance that we wish to demonstrate. These findings also question whether ambiguity tolerance acts as a motivating factor that affects one aspect of the entrepreneurial process. These theoretical contributions provide us with the tool to express the next hypothesis:

H1.3: Ambiguity tolerance has a positive impact on the personal motivations of social entrepreneurs.

Feeling of Competence

The theoretical contributions and the results discussed in this section allow us to formulate two major hypotheses that stress the importance of the locus of control and self-efficacy for social entrepreneurs. For additional clarity, it would be useful to more precisely define these concepts.

Locus of control: Another characteristic of motivation that has attracted researchers' attention is the locus of control. This attention represents the degree to which individuals believe that their actions and personal traits would influence their achievements.

Research indicates that individuals with an internal locus of control often have a more obvious need to realize goals (Brockhaus and Robert, 1982; Gurin et al., 1969).

Similarly, Hansemark (2003) stressed the significant impact of the locus of control in predicting the launching of new businesses. The ability to achieve success in the existing business was also linked to the internal locus of control in accordance with Begley and Boyd (1987) and Durand and Shea, (1974). However, these studies were carried out without any consideration for the differences specific to each type that may exist.

These results also corroborated the findings of Bonnet and Furnham (1991) and Nwachukwu and Saviour, (1995), who recognize the internal locus of control as an aspect of

psychological traits that is important to the spirit of enterprises. This result allows us to state the following hypothesis.

H1.4: The "locus of control" has a positive impact on the personal motivation of social entrepreneurs.

Self-Efficacy: Self-efficacy represents the belief of an individual in his ability to successfully accomplish a goal (Bandura, 1977). Various studies have found that a high self-efficacy constitutes a basis for achieving the maximum of human performance (Bandura et al. 1999). According Markman, Pinshow and Wright (2002) and McMullen and Shepherd (2006) self-efficacy is manifested by the force and belief of an individual in his ability to successfully accomplish a specific task or a series of related tasks. Bandura, (1977), (1982) links this self-confidence with individual capacities, which depend on previous experiences, learning, society and entrepreneurial self-efficacy. McGee, Fairlie, Garnham, et al., (2009) consider this confidence as the belief in the individual ability to successfully accomplish the tasks.

These various determinants seem to have received much attention in the entrepreneurial studies. We accordingly state the following hypothesis:

H1.5: Self-efficacy positively influences the personal motivations of social entrepreneurs.

Effect of Intention on Behaviour

The effect of intention on individual behaviour has not been analysed in detail in the field of entrepreneurship. This effect has been analysed through a variety of target behaviours in a meta-analysis of Kim and Hunter (1993), Bird (1988), and Thomas and Mueller (2000). Intentions have been related to several personal perceptions with regard to the environment of the business and its surrounding society. The culture of a particular society may reinforce certain characteristics and personal behaviours or inhibit and penalize these behaviours. Zahra et al. (1999) studied the role that society plays in determining entrepreneurial behaviour.

According to the "planned behaviour" theory of Ajzen (1991), the intentions to perform a specific behaviour depend directly on three perceptions: the attitudes, perceived behavioural control or self-efficacy, and social standards, as reflected in the influence of the social pressures to adopt certain behaviour. It is assumed that meeting these three conditions is fundamental for forming a favourable intention that leads to powerful behaviour.

Attitude Regarding Behaviour

According to Ajzen (1991) and Emin (2003), the attitude represents the attractiveness of a behaviour. These authors predict that a behaviour would be adopted according to a combination of emotional and cognitive factors. The emotional factor encompasses the importance of feelings, moods and emotions about a person, an idea, an event, or an object. Therefore, personal preferences, attitudes and the inclination towards entrepreneurship give rise to different behaviours. They determine the positive or negative assessment of a person of a specific behaviour (Ajzen 2002; Kolvereid 1996). The attitude with regard to the behaviour represents for Ajzen and Fish-bein, (1980) the degree of assessment, favourable or unfavourable, that a person has of a desired behaviour. They gave reference to the set of feelings, beliefs and

trends that are relatively durable and oriented towards people, groups, ideas, problems, or even specific objects (Petty, Wengener and Fabrigar, 1997).

Social Norms and Behaviour

Social standards result from different perceptions of individuals within the social context and of their relatives. This perception mainly concerns how the different participants, whether family or friends, think of their behaviours. The participants constitute a motivation simulated by different judgements and personal factors, environmental or institutional, which reflect the social dynamics.

Ajzen (1991) defines social standards by referring to different perceived social pressures to perform or abstain from certain behaviours. Ajzen (2002) and Zhao et al. (2005) concretised this concept by observing the ease or difficulty to become an entrepreneur. This variable holds a great importance through its effect on the process of behavioural control and the capacity to predict the perception of behaviour (Zhao et al. 2005).

Perceived Behavioural Control and Behaviour

Intentions to adopt different actions depend on the attitudes, perception of personal desirability and social conditions of the participants. This perception allows scholars to motivate the behaviour to perform such an action or achieve the associated goal.

Thus, according to Ajzen (1991), perceived behavioural control corresponds to the perceived easiness or difficulty to achieve a goal associated with a behaviour. Stated differently, this control refers to the perception of the feasibility of the concerned behaviour. According to Emin (2003), the concept of perceived behavioural control is very close to that of personal efficiency suggested by Bandura (1977) (see also Ajzen, 1991), and similar to the concept of feasibility suggested by Shapero and Sokol (1982) and Tounès (2003).

However, the moderating effect of this control has been supported by several empirical studies, such as Armitage and Conner (2001) and Ajzen (2002). These studies suggest that this control can lead to distinct elements of self-efficacy and controllability, which are similar to the internal and external control. The internal control that includes different intrinsic factors is similar to the concept of self-efficacy. The external control reflects the extrinsic factors. Fitch and Ravlin (2005) described it in terms of resources and opportunities that facilitate the performance of a behaviour.

Intention Predicts Behaviour

Understanding intentions allows us to understand the phenomena and behaviours related to entrepreneurship (Barkovic and Kruzic, 2010). In this context, the behaviour is presented as a direct function of the intention. This intention, in turn, is the result of three conceptual determinants: the attitude vis-a-vis the behaviour, the social norm and the perceived behavioural control. In this sense, Segal et al. (2005) adopt different disciplines to consider and understand behavioural intentions. These different perspectives can develop the capacity to understand and predict entrepreneurial activity.

Similarly, Liñán and Santos (2007) observed that intentions are pre-conditions to achieving the performance of a specific behaviour. Liñán et al. (2010) and Amari et al. (2014) agreed with Fayolle and Degeorge (2004) concerning intention.

The theoretical findings of the different authors (Ajzen (1991); Choo et Wong, 2009) agreed on the importance of entrepreneurial intention for predicting entrepreneurial behaviour. These researchers highlighted intention as the main factor that explains entrepreneurial behaviour in different contexts. Incorporating these different theoretical contributions, we can propose our third research hypothesis.

H3: Intention determines the behaviour of social entrepreneurs.

EXPLICATIVE MODEL OF THE INTENTION AND THE BEHAVIOUR OF SOCIAL ENTREPRENEURS

With respect to this empirical part, we present and discuss the results of the analyses as a main and corroborative component of this study. Our objective is to check the validity of the aforementioned research hypotheses. For this purpose, we tackle the basic elements for this research, as well as the different needs for information. These tools help to determine the effect of personal motivation on entrepreneurial intention and behaviour. The figure below presents the general conceptual model.

Our research problematics for this study are as follows:

- To what extent personal motivation can influence social entrepreneurs' intention?
- To what extent intention can influence the behaviour of social entrepreneurs?

Suggestion of a Measure for Intention and Entrepreneurial Behaviour

Entrepreneurial behaviour can be explained in relation to intention among social entrepreneurs: thank you for answering our question by ticking the boxes which indicate your situation.

In our research, this variable will be measured by the third question in our questionnaire. This variable is measured via different items. These items are drawn from different sources, including Milstein (2005), Fayolle et Degeorge (2006), Choo et Wong (2009), Douglas et Fitzsimmons (2012), and Amari et al. (2014). Thank you for indicating the answer that is closest to what you think about each of the following propositions ranging from (1) "strongly disagree" to (5) "strongly agree".

Factorial Exploratory Analysis

Before applying an FEA to the items constituting the variable of entrepreneurial behaviour, it is necessary to test for the normality of the distribution. In fact, an examination of the coefficients of asymmetry and of the flattening shows that the items constituting the entrepreneurial behaviour variable are distributed normally.

The results of the FEA that measure the entrepreneurial behaviour variable enabled us to conclude about the quality of the communality representation >0.5 (Table 1).

| Table 1 ANALYSIS IN MAIN COMPONENTS APPLIED TO 'ENTREPRENEURIAL BEHAVIOUR' | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Items | Alpha if item eliminated | Quality of representation | Factorial contribution |
| behaviour 1 | 0.792 | 0.591 | 0.768 |
| behaviour 2 | 0.722 | 0.708 | 0.841 |
| behaviour 3 | 0.716 | 0.767 | 0.876 |
| behaviour 4 | 0.72 | 0.736 | 0.857 |
| behaviour 5 | 0.734 | 0.652 | 0.807 |
| Total variance explained | 73.27% | | |
| KMO | 0.781 | | |
| Own value | 2.198 | | |
| Cronbach Alpha | 0.812 | | |

From the main component matrix, it follows that the structure of this variable is unidimensional. In fact, all the items belong to a unique factor. Thus, the factorial contributions of these items (loading) are satisfactory (>0.5). For this variable, the determinant of the correlation matrix is different from zero, which means that this matrix is defined as positive. This explains the absence of multi-collinearity or the absence of information redundancy in the correlation matrix.

According to Roussel et al. (2002), “a matrix is said to be defined positive if all of its own values are positive” and if its determinant is greater than zero.

Referring to Bartlett's tests (test re H_0 : the correlation matrix is an identity matrix) and of KMO (which measures the global integrity between the variables), we can conclude that there exists a minimum of correlations between variables. In fact, these tests indicate respectively that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix (reject H_0 because $p=0.00<0.05$) and that the integrity between the items is 'good' (0.781).

To ensure the reliability of this construct, we had resorted to the most widely used reliability indicator Alpha de Cronback (1955), which measures the global internal consistency of a number of items (Churchill, 1979). For this construct, the indicator shows a value of 0.812. Based on the indicator threshold (0.7) fixed by Nunally (1978), this value indicates that this construct is reliable. In other words, the sample items reproduce quite well the construct 'entrepreneurial behaviour'.

Results of the Factorial Confirmatory Analysis

Quality adjustment of the global measure model

a) Verification of the Model's Quality

• Factorial Confirmatory Analysis:

The previously applied method of Factorial Confirmatory Analysis (FCA) has enabled us to obtain different factors, which are the result of the redistribution of numerous items. These factors require a confirmation through an FCA applied to the context of the so-called measure model (Table 2).

| Table 2 VALUES OF THE ADJUSTMENT INDICES OF THE FACTORIAL CONFIRMATORY ANALYSIS | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------|
| The indications of adjustment | Values obtained | Performance appraisal |
| χ^2/df | 2.05 | (>2) → not satisfactory |
| GFI | 0.931 | (>0.9) → good |
| AGFI | 0.879 | (<0.9) → not satisfactory |
| CFI | 0.934 | (>0.9) → good |
| TLI | 0.909 | (>0.9) → good |
| NFI | 0.921 | (>0.9) → good |
| RMR | 0.052 | (>0.05) → not satisfactory |
| RMSEA | 0.07 | (>0.05) → not satisfactory |

We can report several satisfactory and several unsatisfactory results.

In table number 2, we notice that the quality of "t" is not satisfactory because χ^2/df is higher than 2 and that the values of AGFI, RMR and RMSEA are not satisfactory because they do not correspond to the fixed threshold.

Consequently, it becomes necessary to introduce changes to the initial model to improve its adjustment quality. To this end, we use the elimination approach or the addition approach.

b) Modification of the Measure Model

Our model is based on the CR values (which must be higher than 1.96) and on the extracted average variances. We have eliminated four items: need 1, need 2, behaviour 1, and behaviour 5 to have a good adjustment quality (Table 3).

| Table 3 VALUES OF THE INDICES OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE FACTORIAL CONFIRMATORY ANALYSIS AFTER MODIFICATION | | |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------|
| The indications of adjustment | Values obtained | Performance appraisal |
| χ^2/df | 1.501 | (<2) → good |
| GFI | 0.972 | (>0.9) → good |
| AGFI | 0.966 | (>0.9) → good |
| CFI | 0.987 | (>0.9) → good |
| TLI | 0.981 | (>0.9) → good |
| NFI | 0.951 | (>0.9) → good |
| RMR | 0.034 | (<0.05) → good |
| RMSEA | 0.042 | (<0.05) → good |

• Reliability Test of the Constructs:

To test the reliability of the constructs, we have calculated the Rhô of Jöreskog. The results are presented in the table below (Table 4):

| Table 4 RELIABILITY AFTER MODIFICATION | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Concepts | Dimensions | Rh  of Joreskog |
| Personal motivations | Need for achievement | 0.823 |
| | Risk -Taking | 0.773 |
| | Tolerance to ambiguity | 0.831 |
| | Locus of control | 0.872 |
| | Self-efficacy | 0.793 |
| Intention | Intention | 0.771 |
| Entrepreneurial behavior | Entrepreneurial behavior | 0.836 |

Checking the values of the Rh  of J reskog shows that all the constructs have a threshold that is either above or very close to the threshold fixed by Roussel et al. (2002). Thus, all our constructs proved to be reliable.

c) Validation of the Measure Model:

Once the adjustment quality was cleared, and the studied constructs were demonstrated to be reliable, we checked two types of validities: the convergent validity and the discriminating validity.

• Convergent Validity:

According to Fornell and Larcker (1981), the convergent validity is supported if the extracted average variance calculated for each construct is higher than 0.5. In table 8 below, we present the values of the VME for each construct.

| TABLE 5 The average extracted variance (AEV) of constructs | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------|
| Concepts | Dimensions | VME |
| Personal motivations | Need for achievement | 0.784 |
| | Risk -Taking | 0.696 |
| | Tolerance to ambiguity | 0.863 |
| | Locus of control | 0.688 |
| | Self-efficacy | 0.773 |
| Intention | Intention | 0.703 |
| Entrepreneurial behavior | Entrepreneurial behavior | 0.804 |

• Discriminating Validity:

To speak about the discriminating validity, we must verify that the interior coherence is higher than the value of the correlation squared.

| Table 6 TEST OF THE DISCRIMINATING VALIDITY | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|---------|-----------|---------|------------|-----------|----------|
| | Need | Risk | Tolerance | Control | Efficiency | Intention | behavior |
| Need | 0.784 | | | | | | |
| Risk | 0.143 | 0.696 | | | | | |
| Tolerance | 0.423 | 0.289 | 0.863 | | | | |
| Control | 0.154 | 0.005 | 0.292 | 0.688 | | | |
| Efficiency | 0.053 | 0.057 | 0.005 | 0.116 | 0.773 | | |
| Intention | 0.004 | 0.00001 | 0.063 | 0.071 | 0.001 | 0.703 | |
| behavior | 0.0005 | 0.0161 | 0.002 | 0.005 | 0.0002 | 0.015 | 0.804 |

We therefore conclude that the discriminating validity is supported,

Verification of the Quality of the Structure Model:

- **Factorial Confirmatory Model:**

We carried out the analysis based on the values of the CR and the adjustment indices obtained in the two following tables (Table 7).

| Table 7 VALUES OF ADJUSTMENT INDICES OF THE FACTORIAL CONFIRMATORY ANALYSIS | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------------|
| The indications of adjustment | Values Obtained | Performance appraisal |
| χ^2/df | 2.276 | (>2) → Not satisfactory |
| GFI | 0.932 | (>0.9) → Good |
| AGFI | 0.887 | (<0.9) → Not satisfactory |
| CFI | 0.949 | (>0.9) → Good |
| TLI | 0.922 | (>0.9) → Good |
| NFI | 0.914 | (>0.9) → Good |
| RMR | 0.051 | (>0.05) → Not satisfactory |
| RMSEA | 0.069 | (>0.05) → Not satisfactory |

The results of the Factorial Confirmatory Analysis of the structure model, as well as the values of the adjustment indices, show that it is important to introduce necessary modifications to improve the adjustment quality of the model.

- **Modification of the Structure Model:**

To improve the adjustment quality of our structured model, we shall undertake modifications by elimination based on the values of the CR that are lower than 1.96. Because these modifications are not always sufficient for improving the adjustment quality of the model, we resorted to a 'by addition approach', through which we obtained a good adjustment quality for the structured model. The values of the CR and the indices of the structured model are presented in the following table (Table 8).

| Table 8 THE VALUES OF THE ADJUSTMENT INDICES OF THE MEASURE MODEL AFTER MODIFICATION | | |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|
| The indications of adjustment | Values Obtained | Performance appraisal |
| χ^2/df | 1.423 | (>2) → Good |
| GFI | 0.964 | (>0.9) → Good |
| AGFI | 0.941 | (>0.9) → Good |
| CFI | 0.973 | (>0.9) → Good |
| TLI | 0.982 | (>0.9) → Good |
| NFI | 0.952 | (>0.9) → Good |
| RMR | 0.032 | (<0.05) → Good |
| RMSEA | 0.036 | (<0.05) → Good |

Verification of the Hypotheses

The verification of the hypotheses is carried out through the CR test, i.e., the risk associated with rejecting the null hypothesis (there is no relation between the variable to be explained and the explicative variable), as well as the value and the sign of the coefficients of the standardized regression. The results are similar to those presented in Table 9.

| Table 9 VALIDATION OF THE HYPOTHESES RELATED TO THE REGRESSION RELATIONS | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------|-------|
| Hypothesis | Relations | Standardized coefficients of regression | CR | P |
| H1.1 | The need for achievement → motivations | 0.298 | 2.534 | 0.007 |
| H1.2 | Risk-taking → motivations | 0.201 | 1.988 | 0.092 |
| H1.3 | The tolerance for ambiguity → motivations | -0.033 | -0.448 | 0.476 |
| H1.4 | Locus of control → motivations | 0.303 | 2.986 | 0.006 |
| H1.5 | Self-efficacy → motivations | -0.012 | -0.072 | 0.837 |
| H1 | Motivations → Intention | -0.079 | -1.764 | 0.152 |
| H2 | Intention → behaviour | 0.097 | 1.023 | 0.502 |

This table clearly shows that the effect of the need for realization is confirmed with a CR of approximately 2534 (>1.96) and a p value of approximately 0.007. The risk of rejecting H0 is very low. Thus, the research hypothesis is accepted. These results justify the significant and direct impact of the need for self-realization on the personal motivation of the Saudi social entrepreneurs. Based on previous studies of Murry (1938), McClelland (1961), Robbins et al. (2004), and Eijdenberg and Masurel (2013), we can conclude that this variable constitutes an efficient tool for distinguishing between the Saudi social entrepreneurs and the population in general.

The risk of rejecting the hypothesis that "Risk-taking does not influence personal motivation" is weak (CR=1988>1.96; p=0.092>0.05). The hypothesis H1.2 concerning the effect of risk-taking on personal motivations is thus accepted. This variable has an impact on the personal motivations of the Saudi social entrepreneurs. The latter pursue the idea of enterprise creation when the probability of success is weak. These effects are consistent with the results of

McClelland (1965), Hunter et al., (2003), Gilbert, McDougall and Audretsch (2010) and Mustafa, Lundmark and Ramos (2016).

However, the effect of ambiguity tolerance on personal motivations is also rejected since ($CR = -0.448 < 1.96$ et $p = 0.476 < 0.05$). The hypothesis H1.3 is therefore rejected. This variable does not have an impact on the Saudi social entrepreneurs. Our results thus do not lend support to the findings of Norton (1975), Tsui (1993), and Dawson and Henley (2012), who highlight the impact of ambiguity tolerance on the personal motivation of entrepreneurs.

In fact, the effect of the locus of control is accepted ($CR = 2.986 > 1.96$ and $p = 0.006 > 0.05$). This variable positively influences the personal motivation of the Saudi social entrepreneurs. These results support those obtained in the previous studies of Rotter (1966), Hansemark (2003), and Eijdenberg and Masurel (2013). In this context, we can conclude that the locus of control is an efficient tool for distinguishing between the Saudi social entrepreneurs and the population in general. Therefore, the increasing interest in this variable in the Anglo-saxon literature is confirmed in relation to the Saudi social entrepreneurs. The research hypothesis H1.4 is therefore accepted.

The results also show that the effect of self-efficacy is rejected ($CR = -0.072 < 1.96$ et $p = 0.837 > 0.05$). These results are at odds with those of Legrand (2009) and Ooterbeek et al. (2011) who highlighted the impact of this variable on the motivation of entrepreneurs. Our results reject the impact of self-efficacy among the social entrepreneurs in the Saudi context. This leads us to reject the hypothesis H1.5.

The results show that personal motivations do not have a direct effect on the intentions of Saudi social entrepreneurs with ($CR = -1.764$ and $p = 0.152$). This enables us to reject the hypothesis H1. At the level of this model, the impact of personal motivations is rejected for the Saudi social entrepreneurs. These results are inconsistent with the results of Atkinson (1957) and Gilbert, McDougall and Audretsch (2010), which underscores the importance of personal motivations of entrepreneurs. Our results similarly refute the contribution of Dawson and Henley (2012), who noted that social enterprises are influenced by the antecedents of the latter.

Our empirical results show that the effect of the intention variable on social entrepreneurs is rejected. Concerning this model, the impact of intention on entrepreneurial behaviour is rejected for the Saudi social entrepreneurs ($CR = 1.023$ and $p = 0.502$). This finding contradicts the results of Ajzen and Madden (1986) and Ajzen (1991), who highlighted the importance of intention in the determination of behaviour.

CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we relied on different studies and models that propose a coherent framework. We have adapted and applied them to our case study dealing with social entrepreneurship in a hybrid context.

In this study, we test the effect of personal motivations on entrepreneurial intention (model no 1). In a second phase, we test the effect of this intention on the behaviour of social entrepreneurs (model no 2). Our contributions are based on different analyses of entrepreneurial intention (Kolvereid, 1996; Shapero and Sokol, 1982; Ajzen, 1991; Bandura, 1997; Chen et al. (1998), Liñán F. (2008), Shapero and Sokol (1982), Ashley-Cotleur, Marques, Ferreira, Ferreira, et al., 2012; Ireland and Gorod (2016)), but also on many works dealing with the effect of intention on entrepreneurial intention (Douglas and Fitzsimmons, 2012; Luthje and Franke, 2003)

To accomplish these goals, we have applied the same methodological procedure used in the previous study. Our empirical analysis begins with an analysis of a main component followed

by a confirmatory analysis. On the basis of the results of these statistical analyses, it is possible to conclude that the need for self-realization, risk taking and the locus of control confirm the research hypotheses previously presented in terms of personal motivation. However, in terms of intention, personal motivations cannot explain this variable for the Saudi social entrepreneurs. Our empirical investigations also show that the intention does not have a particular importance for the determination of the behaviour of social entrepreneurs.

Our results suggest that the social entrepreneurs cannot efficiently face their problems, control their tasks and directly translate their attitudes. Given the intensity of the different obstacles, the process of the development of intention and entrepreneurial behaviour is inhibited by these individuals.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen I. Fishbein M. (1980), Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, 278.
- Ajzen I. (2002). Perceived behavioural control, self efficacy, locus of control, and the theory of planned behaviour. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 32, 1-20
- Ajzen I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- Amari F. Abbes, I. & Boudabbous, S. (2014), L'impact des facteurs environnementaux sur l'intention entrepreneuriale. International Conference on Business, Economics, Marketing & Management Research (BEMM'13). 2, 86-91.
- Ashley-Cotleur, C., King, S. & Solomon, G. (2009). Parental and gender influences on entrepreneurial intentions, motivations and attitudes. George Washington University.
- Atkinson, J.W. (1957) Motivational determinants of risk taking behavior. *Psychological Review*, 64, 359-372.
- Bandura, A. (1977) 'Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change', *Psychological Review*, Vol. 84, No. 2, pp.191-215.
- Bandura A., Pastorelli C., Barbaranelli C. & Caprara G.V. (1999). Self-efficacy pathways to childhood depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* vol 76, pp. 258-269.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37(2), 122-147.
- Barkovic, D. & Kruzic, D. (2010). Students' perception and intentions towards entrepreneurship: The empirical findings from Croatia. *The Business Review*, 14(2), 209-215.
- Begley, T.M. & Boyd, D.P. (1987) Psychological characteristics associated with performance in entrepreneurial firms and smaller businesses. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 2(1), 79-93.
- Bird, B. (1988). Implementing Entrepreneurial Ideas: The Case for Intention. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 442-453.
- Bonnett, C. & Furnham, A. (1991). Who wants to be an entrepreneur? A study of adolescents interested in a young enterprise scheme. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 12(3), 465-478.
- Brockhaus & Robert, H. (1982). The psychology of the entrepreneur. *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, 1, 39-57.
- Bornstein, D. (2004) How to change the world: Social entrepreneurs and the power of new ideas. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Busenitz, L. (1999). Entrepreneurial risk and strategic decision-making: It's a matter of perspective. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35(3), 325-341.
- Collins, C., Locke, E. & Hanges, P. (2000). The relationship of need for achievement to entrepreneurial behavior: A meta-analysis. Working paper, University of Maryland, College Park, MD
- Chen, H., Andrea, L., Houston., Robin. R., Sewell. & Bruce. R. (1988). Internet browsing and searching: User evaluations of category map and concept space techniques. *Journal of the American Society for Information Sciences*, 49(7).
- Choo, S. & Wong, M. (2009). Entrepreneurial intention: Triggers and barriers to new venture creations in Singapore. *Singapore Management Review*, 28(2), 47-64.
- Churchill, G.A.Jr. (1979). A paradigm for developing better measures of marketing constructs. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16(1), 64-73.
- Dawson, C. & Henley, A. (2012) "Push" versus "pull" entrepreneurship: An ambiguous distinction? *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 18(6), 697-719.

- Dees, G. (1998) The meaning of social entrepreneurship,
- Douglas E.J. & Fitzsimmons J.R. (2012). Intrapreneurial intensions versus entrepreneurial intensions: Distinct constructs with different antecedents *Small Business Economics (forthcoming)*.
- Durand. & Shea. (1974), "Entrepreneurial activity as a formation of achievement" Motivation 7 reinforcement control, *Journal of Psychology*, 88.
- Eijdenberg, E.L. & Masurel, E. (2013). Entrepreneurial motivation in a least developed country: Push factors and pull factors among MSEs in Uganda. *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 21(1), 19-43.
- Emin, S. (2003), L'intention de créer une entreprise des chercheurs publics : le cas français, Thèse en sciences de gestion, Université Pierre-Mendès-France, ESA, Grenoble.
- Fayolle, A., Degeorge, J.M. & Aloulou, W. (2004) Entre intention et création d'une entreprise nouvelle : Le concept d'engagement. *Série Recherche*.
- Fayolle, A. & DeGeorge, J.M. (2006). Attitudes, intentions, and behaviour: New approaches to evaluating entrepreneurship education. In Fayolle, A. & Klandt, H. (Eds.) *International entrepreneurship education. Issues and Newness*. Cheltenham (UK): Edward Elgar
- Fornell, C. & Larcker, D.F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of marketing research*, 18(1), 39-55.
- Fruchterman J. (2011). For love or lucre. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 42-47.
- Gilbert, B.A., McDougall, P.P. & Audretsch, D.B. (2006). New venture growth: A review and extension. *Journal of management*, 32(6), 926-950.
- Gurin, P., Gurin, G. Las, R. & Beattie, M.M. (1969). Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youths. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25(3), 29-53.
- Hansemark, O.C. (2003) Need for achievement, locus of control and the prediction of business start-ups: A longitudinal. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 24(3), 301-319.
- Huybrechts, B. (2012). Fair trade organizations and social enterprise: Social innovation through hybrid organization models. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hunter., Kapp. & Yonkers. (2003) A psychological model of entrepreneurial behavior, *Journal of Academy of Business and Economics* 2(2), 180-192.
- Ireland, V. & Gorod, A. (2016). Contribution of complex systems to entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 6(1), 1-41.
- Kim, M.S. & Hunter, J.E. (1993). Relationships among attitudes, behavioral intentions, and behavior: A meta-analysis of past research, part 2. *Communication research*, 20(3), 331-364.
- Kolvereid, L. (1996). Prediction of employment status choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 21(1), 47-58.
- Krueger, N.F., Reilly, M.D. & Carsrud, A.L. (2000). Competing models of entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of business venturing*, 15(5), 411-432.
- Langevang, T., Namatovu, R. & Dawa. S. (2012). Beyond necessity and opportunity entrepreneurship: motivations and aspirations of young entrepreneurs in Uganda. *International Development Planning Review*, 34(4), 439-460.
- Legrand. (2009). L'influence du Sentiment d'efficacité personnelle dans la décision de créer une entité, 6ième congrès de l'Académie de l'Entrepreneuriat.
- Liñán, F., Rodríguez-Cohard, J.C. & Rueda-Cantuche, J.M. (2011). Factors affecting entrepreneurial intention levels: A role for education. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 7(2), 195-218.
- Liñán, F. & Santos, F.J. (2007). Does social capital affect entrepreneurial intentions? *International Advances in Economic Research*, 13(4), 443-453.
- Lüthje, C. and Franke, N. (2003). The 'Making' of an Entrepreneur: Testing a Model of Entrepreneurial Intent among Engineering Students at MIT. *R&D Management*, 33, 2.
- Lynn, W.G. (1969). The thyroid In: D'A Bellair, A., Gans, C. & Williams, E. Eds., *Biology of the Reptilia*. Academic Press (In press).
- McClelland, D.C. (1965). Toward a theory of motive acquisition. *American psychologist*, 20(5), 321-333.
- McGee, S.L., Fairlie, E., Garnham, AP. & Hargreaves, M. (2009). Exercise-induced histone modifications in human skeletal muscle. *The Journal of physiology*, 587(24), 5951-5958.
- McMullen, J.S. & Shepherd, D.A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 132-152.
- Milstein, T. (2005). Transformation abroad: Sojourning and the perceived enhancement of self-efficacy. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(2), 217-238.

- Mishra, C.S. & Zachary, R.K. (2015). The theory of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 5(4), 251-268.
- Mustafa, M., Lundmark, E. & Ramos, H.M. (2016). Untangling the relationship between human resource management and corporate entrepreneurship: The mediating effect of middle managers' knowledge sharing. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 6(3), 273-295
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Newth, J. (2016). Social enterprise innovation in context: Stakeholder influence through contestation. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 6(4), 369-399.
- Ng, K.S., Mohammed, A.A.E., Ahmad, A. & Huam, H.T. (2013). Applicability of Altman's revised model in predicting financial distress: A case of PN17 companies quoted in Malaysian Stock Exchange.
- Nicholls, A. (2010). The legitimacy of social entrepreneurship: Reflexive isomorphism in a pre-paradigmatic field. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 34(4), 611-633.
- Nwachukwu., Saviour L.S. (1995). Comparable worth and perception of equity in compensation practices: A review. *Proceedings of the Southwest Academy of Management Annual Conference*, 259-263.
- Norton, R.W. (1975). Measurement of ambiguity for tolerance. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 39(6), 607-619.
- Oosterbeek, H. (2011). The impact of entrepreneurship education on entrepreneurship skills and motivation. *European Economic Review*, 54(3), 442-454.
- Petty, R.E., Wegener, D.T. & Fabrigar, L.R. (1997). Attitudes and attitude change. *Annual review of psychology*, 48(1), 609-647.
- Robbins, S.B., Lauver, K., Le, H., Davis, D., Langley, R. & Carlstrom, A. (2004) Do psychosocial and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(2), 261-288.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. *Psychological Monographs*, 80, 1-28.
- Roussel, P., Durrieu, F., Campoy, E. & AlAkremi, A. (2002) Structural Equation Methods. Research and Management Application, Economica Editions, Research Management Collection. 16th Conference of the AGRH, Paris.
- Salamon, L.M. (2012). *The state of nonprofit America*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Salhi, B. & Boujelbene, Y (2013). Entrepreneurial intent training for students following entrepreneurship programs. *The Management and Organization Review*, 5(1), 40-61.
- Segal, G., Borgia, D., Schoenfeld, J. (2005). The motivation to become an entrepreneur. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 11(1), 42-57.
- Shapero, A. & Sokol, L. (1982) The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In Kent, C., Sexton, D. & Vesper, K. (Eds.), *Encyclopaedia of entrepreneurship*, 72-90.
- Short, J.C., Moss, T.W. & Lumpkin, G.T. (2009). Research in social entrepreneurship: Past contributions and future opportunities. *Strategic entrepreneurship journal*, 3(2), 161-194.
- Stryjan, Y. (2006). The practice of social entrepreneurship: Notes towards a resource-perspective. *Entrepreneurship as Social Change*, 35-55.
- Thomas, A.S. & Mueller, S.L. (2000). A case for comparative entrepreneurship: Assessing the relevance of culture. *Journal of international business studies*, 31(2), 287-301.
- Tounès, A. (2003a). An analytical framework of entrepreneurship education in France: A tool for the benefit of educational innovation, 6th Scientific Days of the Entrepreneurship Network of the AUF, *Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, 748-761.
- Tsui, K.Y. (1993). Decomposition of China's regional inequalities. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 17(3), 600-627.
- Woodfield, P., Woods, C. & Shepherd, D. (2017). Appreciating entrepreneurship: A new approach for field research. *Entrepreneurship Research Journal*, 7(2).
- Xiao, J.J., Alhabeed, M., HONG, G.S. & Haynes, G.W. (2001). Attitude toward Risk and risk-taking behavior of business-owning families. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 35(2), 307-325.
- Zhao, M., Nemani, R. & Running, S. (2005). Sensitivity of Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) terrestrial primary production to the accuracy of meteorological reanalyses. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 111.
- Zahra, S.A., Neilsen, A.P. & Bogner, W.C. (1999). Corporate entrepreneurship, knowledge, and competence development. *Entrepreneurship Theory & Practice*, 23(3), 169-189.